

## The Ecuadorian School of Thoughts of the Sumak Kawsay

Estefania Aguirre Chauvin

### スマック・クワサイに関するエクアドルにおける諸学派

エステファニア・アギレ・チャウビン

#### 要 旨

歴史的に疎外されてきたアビヤヤラ（ラテンアメリカ）の先住民コミュニティは、過去数十年で躍進し、資本主義システムを克服し、新しい社会的、経済的、文化的、政治的、環境的状况を作り出すことを目的とした社会変革の根本的なパラダイムであるスマック・カワサイを提案した。

キチュワまたはケチュアからのスマックカウサイの翻訳は複雑で議論的となっている。しかし、スマックカウサイはエクアドル共和国の政治憲法（2008）で「幸福」として正式に翻訳され、スマックカマニャも、ボリビアの政治憲法（2009）で「幸福」として訳されている。

両国の先住民の社会経済的、環境的、文化的主張を統合するために、スマック・カウサイとスマック・カマニャが両方の憲法で認められて以来、その概念は学術界でも大きく取り上げられるようになった。翻訳語のみならず、起源や政治社会的変革の理論的提案としての側面もあり、その概念の複雑さが際立っている。

本研究では、3つのエクアドルの学説を元に、(1) 社会主義者および統計学者、(2) 生態学者 (3) 先住民いわゆるパチャマミスタから見た幸福論について説明する。そして各学説がいかに幸福論の理解に貢献しているか、それらの共通点、相違点を明確にする。



## Table of contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Background of the *sumak kawsay*
- III. Debates over the *sumak kawsay*
  - 1. The socialist and statist school of thought
  - 2. The ecologist and post-developmental school of thought
  - 3. The indigenist and “*pachamamista*” school of thought
- IV. Criticisms, coincidences and differences on the *sumak kawsay*
  - 1. Is *sumak kawsay* an invention?
  - 2. The translation of *sumak kawsay*
  - 3. The origin of *sumak kawsay*: an alternative development or an alternative to development?
  - 4. The application and scope of *sumak kawsay*
- V. Conclusions

## I. Introduction

The indigenous communities of *Abya-Yala* (Latin America), which have been historically marginalized, have emerged strongly in the last decades and have proposed the *sumak kawsay* as a radical paradigm of social transformation aimed to overcome the capitalist system and to create new social, economic, cultural, political and environment conditions.

The translation of *sumak kawsay* from Kichwa or Quechua is complex and on debate. However, *sumak kawsay* has been formally translated as well living in the Political Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador (2008) and *sumak qamaña* as living well in the Political Constitution of the State of Bolivia (2009).

Since *sumak kawsay* and *sumak qamaña* were recognized by both Constitutions, in order to integrate the socio-economic, environmental and cultural claims of the indigenous peoples of both countries, its conceptualization has gained great academic relevance, not without opening several debates on its translation, origin and its dimensions as a theoretical proposal of a political-social transformation, highlighting the complexity of the concept.

This article presents a review of the background of the *sumak kawsay* and of the three Ecuadorian schools of thought on the *sumak kawsay* / well living that have been classified as (1) the socialist and statist, (2) the ecologist and post-developmental, and (3) the indigenist and “*pachamamista*”. The purpose of the article is to determine how each stream contributes to the understanding of the *sumak kawsay* and well living in terms of its concept, origin and scope, what they have in common and what their differences are.

It should be mentioned that the literature review was mainly in Spanish sources; therefore, I have translated all the citations.

## II. Background of the *sumak kawsay*

The Political Constitution of the Republic Ecuador of 2008<sup>1</sup> (Constitution of Ecuador) and the Political Constitution of the State of Bolivia of 2009<sup>2</sup> (Constitution of Bolivia), introduced important innovations with new constitutional paradigms, such

as the *sumak kawsay* (well living) and *pachamama* (mother earth), within the current mainstream of *Neoconstitucionalismo*<sup>3</sup> or Andean Constitutionalism, as part of a political and legal transformation that intends to divest itself of imported ideas that have not been able to deal with social problems, economic inequality and exclusion, mainly of indigenous people, as well as of the destruction of nature.

The indigenous people and their communities have been discriminated and marginalized for centuries, placing them in a disadvantaged situation in relation to other sectors of society. Cimadamore argues that in Latin America multiple political, economic, social, military and environmental factors set a pattern that links in a complex way indigenous people to poverty (Cimadamore, 2006: 17).

In this context of historical marginalization and as a result of the first agrarian reform of 1964 indigenous communities made an effort to bring themselves and their communities together in a political movement, which purpose was to jointly organize political actions. As the movement became stronger and began to slowly gain political arena, there was the need to form a more inclusive movement, therefore in November of 1986, the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) was constituted.

The fundamental objectives of the CONAIE were to consolidate indigenous people and nationalities of Ecuador and to demand rights regarding indigenous territories and natural resources. CONAIE has declared that the center of the indigenous life rests on ancestral knowledge and practices, the management of agricultural calendars, the relationship with nature and the strong interpersonal links in the community (CONAIE).

In order to advance in their political agenda, to be able to participate in the elections and to obtain seats in the National Congress of Ecuador, the Pachakutik Plurinational Unity Movement - New Country (PACHAKUTIK) was founded in January 1996 as a left wing indigenist party. The Pachakutik party “aims for a qualitative and political step in the national and international scene; promotes a political project for society and proposes to build a Plurinational State, that is, re-found a different State that ensures unity in diversity and social equality” (CONAIE).

However, the discontent of indigenous people because of the ongoing discrimination led to the first ‘indigenous uprising’ of May 1990, which was a significant breakthrough in the history of indigenous movements. After a long organizational process, indigenous movements took over the streets and paralyzed the country. This laid the ground for the first meeting of indigenous leaders with the President of the Republic in the history of Ecuador and their growing recognition in the political arena.

Within the political sphere, indigenous leaders and intellectuals began introducing new concepts and principles in order to build a more just, equitable and solidary society, promoting adequate public policies to face the endemic problems of Ecuador, which are also common for the rest of the countries of Latin America.

In this sense, indigenism as a political ideology has made an effort to achieve and develop in written communication the ancestral knowledge (such as *sumak kawsay* and *pachamama*) that drives their lives and their vision of the world. This has been a challenge, since knowledge has only been transferred orally from generation to generation, however, since the end of 1990, essays and articles on these topics have been published gradually.

Since the year 2000, the recognition and reconstruction of the *sumak kawsay* by indigenous intellectuals has emerged, as a way of life in harmony with nature and with other human beings and as a concept that has been referred to as the aspiration of many indigenous peoples in *Abya Yala* (Latin America) (Hidalgo-Captain, 2014: 30). This concept began to have an impact on the academic, economic, legal and political level.

The emergence of *sumak kawsay* as an indigenous ideology begins with the contributions of Ecuadorian Kichwas (Viteri, 2000), Bolivian Aymara (Yampara, 2001) and Quechua Peruvians (Rengifo, 2002) and since its recognition in the Constitution of Ecuador and in the Constitution of Bolivia, many Latin American and European intellectuals have contributed to the debate and development of this concept (Hidalgo-Captain, 2014: 30).

Likewise, since 2008 Ecuadorian indigenous movements have taken the concept of *sumak kawsay* as a banner of their political claims, the defense of *sumak kawsay* now joins “traditional claims of Ecuadorian indigenism such as the Plurinational State, self-determination, use and valorization of the indigenous languages, the care of the pachamama, the respect of the traditions and indigenous customs, the community organization of the society ...” (Hidalgo-Capitan, 2014: 17).

Specifically, the idea of the *sumak kawsay* emerged as a stand against conventional development and as a search for alternatives to improve the quality of life and protect the nature (Gudynas, 2011). Some authors argue that the concept developed due to several factors that converge with the growing force of the political presence of indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia that was considered one of the most novel and complex social and political phenomena in Latin America (Davalos, 2006).

### III. Debates over the *sumak kawsay*

Since the *sumak kawsay* and the *sumak qamaña* were recognized by the Constitution of Ecuador and Bolivia respectively, in order to integrate the socio-economic, environmental and cultural claims of the indigenous peoples of both countries, its conceptualization has gained great academic relevance, not without opening several debates on its translation, origin and its dimensions as a theoretical proposal of a political-social transformation, highlighting the complexity of the concept.

The debates rest on three Ecuadorian schools of thought about the *sumak kawsay* and the well living that have been cataloged by Hidalgo and Cubillo (2014b) as: (1) the socialist and statist, (2) the ecologist and post-developmental, and (3) the indigenist and “*pachamamista*” (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 27).

#### 1. The socialist and statist school of thought

The socialist and statist school of thought denominated as the “Socialism of Well Living” or the “Socialism of *Sumak Kawsay*”, is based on modern western cultural thought, located in modernism, since they consider that the use of reason must guide human behavior and knowledge (Habermas, 1985 cited in Hidalgo and Cubillo 2014: 30). In this sense, the *sumak kawsay* would be “a rational proposal of social transformation that seeks (...) equity, while maintaining harmony with nature” (Ramírez, 2010, Patiño, 2001, Habermas, 1985, cited in Hidalgo and Cubillo 2014: 30).

This school of thought considers the *sumak kawsay* as an element of socialism that develops within the “21st century Socialism” as a new post-capitalist economic system with contributions from neo-Marxist thought (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 27). The main representatives would be the former President of the Republic of Ecuador, Rafael Correa, the former National Secretary of Planning for Development, René Ramírez, the President of Bolivia, Evo Morales and the Vice President of Bolivia Álvaro García. In addition, it has been developed by Latin American and European intellectuals, and by socialist politicians from Ecuador and Bolivia (Coraggio, 2007, García-Linera, 2010, Ramírez, 2010, Páez, 2010, Patiño, 2010, Harnecker, 2010, Borón, 2010; Santos, 2010, Houtart, 2010, Pomar, 2010, SENPLADES, 2009 and 2011) (Hidalgo and

Cubillo, 2014b: 27-28).

The central objective of well living for the socialists and statist is achieved through the enactment of laws and the management of public policies aimed at social equity. The enactment of laws must be in accordance with the constitution, which defines well living in the preamble as a new form of citizen coexistence, in diversity and harmony with nature<sup>4</sup>.

In this context, the *sumak kawsay* became official as a State policy in 2008, through the National Plan for Well Living 2013-2017 (PNBV) generated by the National Secretariat for Planning and Development (SENPLADES), based on the fact that “the Andean indigenous people contribute to this debate from other epistemologies and cosmovisions” (SENPLADES, 2013: 32), in regards to “the harmonious relationship between human beings and nature” (SENPLADES, 2013: 34).

According to the Constitution, one of the State’s prime duties is “Planning national development, eliminating poverty, and promoting sustainable development and the equitable redistribution of resources and wealth to enable access to the good way of living” (Article 3, numeral 5). The well living rights are considered to be water and food (Articles 12-13); healthy environment (Articles 14-15); information and communication (Articles 16-20); culture and science (Articles 20-25); education (Articles 26-29); habitat and housing (Articles 30-31); health (Articles 32); labor and social security (Articles 33-34).

These rights have been materialized in the public policies of the PNBV as guidelines to achieve a “way of life that allows the happiness and permanence of cultural and environmental diversity; it is harmony, equality, equity and solidarity” (SENPLADES, 2013: 13).

In order to meet the objectives of the well living, the PNBV has drawn public policies within three axes: People’s Power and the State, Rights and Freedoms for Well Living and Economic and Productive Transformation. These public policies are developed the National Development Objectives:

1. Consolidate the democratic state and the construction of popular power.
2. Sponsor equality, cohesion, inclusion and social and territorial equity, in diversity.
3. Improve the quality of life of the population.
4. Strengthen the capacities and potential of citizens.
5. Build spaces for common meetings and strengthen national identity, diverse identities, plurinationality and interculturality.
6. Consolidate the transformation of justice and strengthen integral security, in strict respect of human rights.
7. Guarantee the rights of nature and promote territorial and global environmental sustainability.
8. Consolidate the social and solidarity economic system in a sustainable manner.
9. Guarantee decent work in all its forms.
10. Promote the transformation of the productive matrix.
11. Ensure the sovereignty and efficiency of strategic sectors for industrial and technological transformation.
12. Guarantee sovereignty and peace, and deepen strategic insertion in the world and Latin American integration.

In this sense, Ramírez argues that the guidelines of well living are aimed at:

The satisfaction of needs, the attainment of a decent quality of life and death, the love and being loved, and the healthy flowering of all, in peace and harmony with nature, for the indefinite prolongation of human cultures and of the biodiversity. The Well Living or Sumak Kawsay supposes to have time for contemplation, friendship, emancipation, the extension of the possibilities of socialization, and that the freedoms, opportunities, capacities and real potentials

of the individuals / collectives expand and flourish so that they allow to achieve simultaneously what society, the territories, the diverse collective identities and each one - seen as a human / collective, universal and particular at the same time - value as a desirable life objective (both materially and subjectively, without producing any type of domination over another human being). The concept of Well Living forces us to reconstruct the public and the common to recognize, understand and value each other - and nature - as diverse but equal, in order to prosper the possibility of reciprocity and mutual recognition, and with it make viable the self-realization and the construction of a shared social future. (Ramírez, 2012b: 20-21).

In short, the guidelines of well living aim at the protection of nature, the satisfaction of material needs, enjoyment of relational goods and happiness, respect for diversity, ethics of coexistence, social equity, intergenerational justice, being and feeling (Leon, 2015: 45).

However, there are many criticisms from the indigenist and *pachamamista* and ecologist and post-developmental schools about the application of PNBV, especially in the environmental field, in the economic model and in the political participation.

In the environmental field it has been cataloged as an anthropocentric conception in which nature, despite being recognized as a subject of rights in the 2008 Constitution<sup>5</sup> and to enact that the human being must live in harmony with it<sup>6</sup>, respecting and protecting it<sup>7</sup>, the State considers nature as a 'natural resource' that is at its disposal for its appropriation and use, thus allowing extractivism as a model of development "for the change of the socioeconomic structures of society and the construction of a society of well living postextractivist and postcapitalist" (Le Quang & Vercoutère, 2013: 39-40, cited in Leon, 2015: 44). A case that has been very important in recent years and for which the government has been harshly criticized both nationally and internationally is about extractivism in the National Park Yasuni, a protected area declared by UNESCO in 1989 as a Biosphere Reserve.

Likewise, the public policies and their application have been criticized because they respond to the economic model of modern development and progress, which has been questioned by several authors, since the concepts of development and progress that strengthen mechanisms of colonization and accumulation of capital, are radically contrary to the concept of the *sumak kawsay* (Dávalos, 2014: 258).

Jaime Carpio affirms that the aspirations of well living "are 'institutionalized' in the constitution, in the national plan of well living, in public policies and other agencies and governmental instruments, in this way the socialism of well living, would be more similar to a model of a bureaucratic and centralist State instead of a Plurinational State with participatory democracy" (Carpio, 2015: 131). In this sense, popular or indigenous participation is not allowed. For example, in the participatory process concerning the construction of PNBV, only the contributions of 8,100<sup>9</sup> citizens were included and the voices of indigenous communities, popular groups and social movements were not taken into account.

Because of the contradictions between the *sumak kawsay*, the well living and institutional practices, indigenous intellectuals consider that the State has used the name of the *sumak kawsay* as an official discourse at a national and an international level "as a political marketing, legitimizing a predominantly developmentalist and extractivist program" (Guyanas and Acosta 2011: 82, cited in Carpio 2015: 133), which is in fact contrary to the conception and practice of the *sumak kawsay* in indigenous communities.

## 2. The ecologist and post-developmental school of thought

The ecologist and post-developmental is based on post-modern constructivist thinking, being the *sumak kawsay* a proposal that is not yet finished and that needs to be built in a “participatory manner with intellectual contributions from very diverse reference frameworks, some pre-modern (as indigenous ancestral traditions), other modern ones (such as neo-Marxist socialism) and other post-modern ones (such as deep ecology or postmodern feminism) forming a kind of post-modern collage” (Oviedo, 2011: 237-8 cited in Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 30) <sup>10</sup>.

Among its main representatives would be progressive Latin American and European intellectuals linked to environmentalism and other social movements (León, 2009, Tortosa, 2009, Escobar, 2009, Esteva, 2009, Carpio, 2009, Quintero, 2009, Quirola, 2009, Gudynas, 2009a, 2009b and 2011, Acosta, 2010a, 2010b, 2011 and 2012, Boff, 2010, Quijano, 2011, Lang, 2011, Prada, 2011, Svampa, 2011, Aguinaga et al., 2011, Vega, 2011, Vega, 2012 ; Lander, 2013) (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 28).

This school of thought affirms that the concept of the *sumak kawsay* is not completely developed; moreover it should be seen as a diverse and on going multicultural construction between the contributions of indigenous communities and socialists, feminists, theological and, above all, ecologists. The *sumak kawsay* would be an:

Utopia for (re) construct, based on the ancestral indigenous cosmovisions but that also includes the contributions of multiple forms of thought in the world. For this school the well living would be centered in the respect to the life of all the alive beings, not only the human beings, endowing it, consequently, a biocentric character instead of anthropocentric. It includes harmony with nature, respect for human dignity and improvement in the quality of life of people and communities. They consider that there is not a single well living, but multiple good lives or good convivals according to the types of life that different communities or peoples have reasons to value (Acosta, 2014: 320, cited in Leon, 2015: 40-41).

Therefore, the ecological and post-developmental trend has as a central point the harmony with oneself, with the community and with nature. Harmony with oneself is related to respect for cultural diversity and the proposal of a Plurinational State; harmony with the community is related to social equity and the proposal of an anti-capitalist society; and, harmony with nature is related to environmental sustainability and biocentrism.

Participatory construction also implies that well living must be developed by governments and peoples, “each nation must create it, design it and concretize it with its people from the local area” (Ramírez and Altriano, 2014: 118). Therefore the concept of *sumak kawsay* and its application as a way of life must be a participatory construction taking into account the society to which it belongs, so that its application becomes meaningful and not be an imposition of ancestral practices or closed public policies that are developed exclusively by the State.

For the ecologist and post-developmental, the political project that they propose as an alternative to the concept of development and progress of capitalism, supposes a paradigmatic change that requires questioning scientific rationalism and the elimination of coloniality.

The criticism towards scientific rationalism focuses on the fact that knowledge is valid only if it is written, since what is not written does not exist and what can not be quantified is irrelevant, so other forms of knowledge and learning are invisible in the western academic world. This has caused that the rationalism reflected in science and in the production of an acceptable



“truth”, in the end marginalized, excluded or made invisible other forms of knowledge, such as those that have emerged in Andean philosophy.

The elimination or overcoming of coloniality, understood as the imposition of control, domination and exploitation of people to another in the economic, political, social, cultural, individual and knowledge dimensions (Mignolio, 2007: 36), implies “unveiling the logic covert that imposes control, domination and exploitation, a logic hidden behind the discourse of salvation, progress, modernization and the common good” (Mignolo, 2007: 32). That is to say, to be liberated through the critical thinking, of the pattern of power that denotes the structure of domination of the western hegemonic modernity and to look for emancipatory proposals.

Overcoming scientific rationalism and colonialism can lead to the capacity of embracing other kinds on knowledge and understanding other ways living. Recognizing the *sumak kawsay* as a proposal that considers the generation of livelihoods, equity, sustainability and empowerment different from the Western and Eurocentric hegemonic thinking.

Their theories have been cataloged as a “childish environmentalism”, in addition to not being very pragmatic (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 28) by the government of Rafael Correa, and of “distorting the ancestral character of the *sumak kawsay* by combining elements of the indigenous worldview with elements of the worldview occidental” (Oviedo 2011, 175-76 cited in Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 28-29) by the indigenista-pachamamista school of thought.

However, for the ecologist and post-developmental the *sumak kawsay* is not distorted but it is enriched by ancestral and modern knowledge, that is to say, the polytopic hermeneutics of Esterman (Ávila, 2015: 39) is applied “which includes the point of view of the others, the participation of more than two cultural or civilizational traditions in intercultural politics. Including in the reflections also the other and the other non-human, that is, esophical alterity” (Esterman, 2014: 51 cited in Ávila, 2015: 39).

In short, this school of thought criticizes the paradigms of development and progress of capitalism and proposes to build a well living of indigenous knowledge and practices as well as emancipatory theories for the protection of nature and to achieve a dignified life in harmony with oneself, with the community and with all the beings of the Pachamama.

### 3. The indigenist and “*pachamamista*” school of thought

The indigenist school of thought also denoted as the “*Pachamamista*”, is based on ancestral indigenous Andean-Amazonian thought. *Pachamamista* has been defined as a “rhetorical defense of Mother-Earth through ancestral 'moral and metaphysical appeals', in order to avoid a reflection on how to undertake an authentic process of mental, economic and cultural decolonization” (Rodríguez, 2011: 1, cited in Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 27).

Its trend is recognized as original or pre-modern, referring to the *sumak kawsay* as “a philosophy of life based on the ancestral traditions of indigenous peoples (...) in a framework of cultural reference that existed before the emergence of modernism in Western culture” (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 29). In this sense, the *sumak kawsay* would be a proposal that arises from the Andean cosmovisions that has its origin in the indigenous struggles and demands and that, therefore, its concept must start from the indigenous self-determination and the Andean spiritual elements.

Its main leaders are Ecuadorian Kichwa indigenists, Bolivian Aymara and Quechua Peruvians and some indigeno-mestizo and white intellectuals (Viteri, 2000, Yampara, 2001, Medina, 2001, Gengrifo, 2002, Pacari, 2009, Albó, 2010, Macas,



2010a, Chancoso, , 2010, Choquehuanca 2010a and 2010b, Huanacuni, 2010, Dávalos, 2011, Oviedo, 2011, Lajo, 2011, Simbaña, 2011 (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 29) (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014b: 29).

From an indigenist perspective the *sumak kawsay* is “that philosophy of life of the indigenous people based on the search and maintenance of harmony with the community and with other beings of nature” (Hidalgo-Capitán, 2014: 29). It is a proposal to move towards a different kind of society, breaking the unilinear vision of progress and the development of the unsustainable, predatory and ethnocidal Western and hegemonic vision” (Bretón, Cortez, García 2015: 10). This applies to “a specific territory that constitutes a vital cosmos in which material and spiritual elements interact” (Hidalgo-Capitán 2014: 29).

The CONAIE defines the *sumak kawsay* as the center of indigenous life that “rests on the knowledge and practice of ancestral indigenous medicine, the management of agricultural calendars, the relationship with nature and the strong interpersonal links in the community” (CONAIE, 2008). The Development Council of the Nationalities and Peoples of Ecuador (CODENPE) affirms that *sumak kawsay* is a new paradigm of life compared to the development model of the Ecuadorian state:

*Sumak kawsay* in its maximum expression is to live in community, fullness, brotherhood, complementarity, relationality between human beings and nature, and human beings and spirituality. In this sense, we emphasize that the ancestral thought is eminently collective: necessarily resort to the idea of the *us* because the world cannot be understood from the perspective of individualism [...] Finally we can point out that well living is not simply a romantic discourse but implies assuming challenges aimed at defining profound transformations in our societies, in opposition to the capitalist logic of economic growth and accumulation of profits (CODENPE, 2001: 23).

According to Carlos Viteri, an Ecuadorian anthropologist, belonging to the Sarayaku indigenous people, and the main disseminator of the concept of *sumak kawsay* in the intellectual and political sphere, the *sumak kawsay* is:

The daily way of life and, at the same time, as the ideal of life of the sarayakuruna, in particular, and of other Amazonian peoples, in general: *Súmak káusai* is 'well living' or 'harmonious living' (...) what the saraya-kuruna conceive as the ideal meaning of life (...) alludes to an ideal condition of existence without deficiencies or crisis (...) [and] a social practice oriented to avoid falling just in aberrant conditions of existence (Viteri, 2003: 46-48).

For this school of thought, *sumak kawsay* has been retaken, recreated and enriched “from the confirmation of the ancestral experiences of the indigenous peoples and their way of constructing both their sociability and their realization with nature” (Dávalos, 2011a: 201, cited in Hidalgo-Capitán, 2014: 33). In fact, there are several communities in the Andes and Amazonia region; one of them is the Amazon community of Sarayaku<sup>11</sup>, which defenders *Sumak Kawsay* as:

Our main deities, Amazanga and Nunguli, remind us that we should only take from nature what we need if we want to have a future. They have never accepted that we hunt more than allowed or that we sow without respecting the rules of Ukupacha and Kaypacha. Their anger, complacency and wisdom have been revealed to us through our sages and women, who have taught us about the secrets to achieve harmony with oneself and with nature, our maxim of Sumak Kawsay.

Thus, it was necessary to give time of regeneration to nature, in order to renew our own life. We have been in permanent movement, allowing us and the other forms of life to continue their cycle. Mushuk Allpa, the land in permanent renovation, has been a fundamental premise of the Sumak Kawsay. To be, to grow, to do and to be in our space of life, means to live according to the norms given by the spirits in the voice of our sages. Fundamentally, and despite attempts from outside to organize ourselves in other ways, we have had to adapt according to the order and the rules of Sacha [earth] itself. This has allowed us to live a relationship of mutual complementarity, and with it satisfy our health, housing, food and education, that is, the material basis of our lives, full of changes, mobility and cycles, which has allowed nature to rest and be revitalized, and with it also ourselves (Sarayaku 2003, 79).

Harmony with the nature and territory means only obtaining the necessary resources for basic sustenance, so the indigenous need to have inner strength, balanced behavior, wisdom, understanding, vision of the future, perseverance and compassion to interact with the garden, the jungle and the waters, with good management of the land and respect for their reproductive cycles (Hidalgo-Capitán, 2014: 29). The ethical dimension, is related to values such as domestic harmony, solidarity, help, generosity, the obligation to receive, reciprocity, advice and listening (Viteri, 2003: 66-71). In economic dimensions, indigenous practice community economy through reciprocity: work collectively in goods for common use without receiving remuneration; giving and receiving without determining time, space and action; work that is received to be returned at another opportunity; work that benefits several people; donate materials for work; pick up leftovers from the crops; exchange to supplement food or something necessary; and give land to others to cultivate (Acosta, 2010: 184-190).

Furthermore, the *sumak kawsay* is based on four fundamental principles (1) the relationality, that refers to the interconnection between all the elements of a whole; (2) the correspondence, that refers to the fact that the elements of reality correspond in a harmonious way, in the manner of proportionality; (3) the complementarity that is based on the fact that the opposites can be complementary; and, (4) the reciprocity, that has to do with the reciprocal relationship between the worlds above, below, now, and between human beings and nature, a kind of co-participation (Maldonado, 2010: 204).

For indigenous leaders, the recognition of the *sumak kawsay* in a public and political debate is a step forward in the conformation of a plural and inclusive State, “it is the first time that indigenous notions that express ancestral coexistence practices that are respectful with nature, with societies and with human beings, are positioned visibly in the political debate and it inscribes strongly in the horizon of human possibilities” (Chuji, 2014b: 232). This political project questions the principles that have traditionally guided the exercise of power and democracy, but at the same time, it offers the possibility of building a new path. As Dolores Cacuango would have said: “we planted the *straw of the moor* in the Constitution itself” (Hidalgo-Capitan 2014: 17).

This trend is criticized for excessive reference to the spiritual elements of the *sumak kawsay* (Stefanoni, 2010a and 2010b) and its resistance to incorporate into its analysis other elements that are not necessarily part of Andean cosmovisions (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 29).

In sum, the postulates of the indigenist and *pachamamista* of the *sumak kawsay* are based on a set of principles with a strong spiritual connotation in opposition to materialism and modern economic approaches.

## IV. Criticisms, coincidences and differences on the *sumak kawsay*

### 1. Is *Sumak Kawsay* an invention?

Since the appearance of the *sumak kawsay* in the academic world, some authors have argued that this term is an invention of indigenous intellectuals, for western anthropologists have not identified it in their studies as a concept of form of life (Viola, 2011: 272, cited in Hidalgo-Capitan, 2014: 33). However, “the fact that the *sumak kawsay* has not been 'discovered' (Viola, 2011: 271) by western anthropologists does not mean that it has not been there” (Hidalgo-Capitan, 2014: 33).

Indigenous intellectuals have responded that first there was a confirmation of the existence of a tradition of practices in indigenous communities that was later systematized

As a 'vital aspiration' and a 'vital daily life' of the Ecuadorian Amazon Kichwa people of Sarayaku” (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 33) and that “this philosophy of life, based on a series of qualities and values of the Amazon indigenous Kichwas, are on the other hand very similar to those identified in the Peruvian indigenous communities (Rengifo, 2002, cited in Leon, 2015: 40), which made it ‘emerge’ (...) under the name of *sumac kausai* (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 34).

In addition, the current daily and traditional practices of the indigenous Andean and Amazonian communities of Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru, based on the principles of relationality, correspondence, complementarity and reciprocity of the *sumak kawsay*, were represented by the drawing of Joan de Santa Cruz Pachacuti Yamqui Salcamayagua in 1613 of the *chakana*, which is the “Andean Cross” that reflects the balance and harmony of the entire universe.

According to Macas, the *sumak kawsay* is revealed in the central part of the *chakana* as the essence of the system: the concurrence of the four fundamental proportions that interrelate and interact with each other in four directions: *yachay* (‘wisdom’) on the top, *ruray* (‘do, experiment, create’) on the bottom, *ushay* (‘energy, collective power’) on the left, and *munay* (‘will, affectivity’) on the right. Four dimensions, all complementary to each other (Macas, 2014: 185).

In this sense, the *chakana*, which has the shape of a house, implies that ‘all’ belongs to a single family under one roof. Inside the house, everything is related through the spatial axes of up/down and right/left (Estermann, 1998: 162) in relation to the here and now, which is a combination of the present-past-future. And also, the *sumak kawsay* is supported on a community paradigm that is the harmony of life and the balance with the environment (Huanacuni 2010, Macas 2014, Estermann 1998). The community is understood as the relationships between the parts that form a whole, human or not, which coincides with current indigenous beliefs and practices.

### 2. The translation of *sumak kawsay*

There have also been debates about the translation of the Kichwa words of *sumak kawsay*. The translation impelled by the socialist-statist trend was formally recognized in the Constitution of Ecuador as *well living*, which has generated debate and rejection on the part of the indigenist-pachamamista school of thought.

The literal translation of the *sumak kawsay* from the indigenist-pachamamista has another connotation, since *sumak* means fullness, sublime, beautiful, superior, integral; and *kawsay* means life in a whole, balanced with the universe and the beings. So *sumak kawsay* would be the *fullness of life* and not well living.

Some authors such as Luis Macas, (2010b) and Nina Pacari (2013), maintain that “*Alli Kawsay*” means “Well Living” and refers only to material well-being without considering the spiritual aspect, while “*Sumak Kawsay*” means “*Life in Fullness*”. The indigenists prefer to speak of *sumak kawsay* instead of well living. They define the *sumak kawsay* as “life in plenitude or fullness of life that includes the spiritual dimension, which would be key in ancestral indigenous ways of life” (Leon, 2015: Libro: 40). For this reason, this school of thought considers that from the socialist-statist and ecologist-post-development conception, it does not include the spiritual dimension of the Andean-Amazonian indigenous worldview and that on the other hand, it has included Western thinking that has no relation to ancestral cultures (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 29).

In the case of Bolivia, the participation of large indigenous majorities promoted the insertion of the dominated “ethical-moral principles of the plural society”, among them the *suma qamaña* (to live well<sup>12</sup>) that is relatively equivalent to the *sumak kawsay* of Ecuador. The translation of *suma* of the Aymara language is “beautiful, beautiful, pleasant, good, kind”, but also, “excellent, finished, perfect” (Albó, 2009: 2) and *qamaña* is “to live, to live, to live together” and “dwell, rest, shelter and take care of others” (Albó, 2009: 1). In the Constitution of the Plurinational State of Bolivia of 2009 it has been established as good life or good living.

However, in general, the three schools of thoughts coincide in the definition of *sumak kawsay* as a way of life in harmony with nature and with other human beings, supported by the principles of social equity and environmental sustainability (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 26). They also agree that the *sumak kawsay* refers to a way of life and coexistence in harmony with nature and with other human beings, inspired by the ancestral culture of the Andean-Amazonian indigenous peoples, which is based on the principles of social equity and environmental sustainability and that aspires to become an alternative to the notion of development of western civilization (Ramírez 2010, Dávalos 2011, Acosta 2012a).

### 3. The origin of *sumak kawsay*: an alternative development or an alternative to development?

With regard to the origin of the *sumak kawsay*, the indigenist-pachamamista and above all, the ecologist and post-developmental, state that the world is at a critical moment with a “profound multidimensional crisis characterized by social inequality, environmental destruction, financial debacle, armed conflicts and contradictory political leadership” (Quirola, 2009: 103). In this context, the collective conscience is increasingly growing about the need to generate changes, to deconstruct traditional political, economic, cultural and social structures and to collectively look for alternatives to build a new model of society. Current structures have been established under the economic model of capitalism, expanding through the rhetoric of development and progress, which functions as a natural and inevitable order that causes inequality, exclusion, destruction, violence and death (Ávila, 2015: 4). In this sense, these currents are a radical critique of the utopia of development and the ideology of progress of the capitalist system.

In this context, they reject the western notion of alternative development, it is constantly reaffirmed that the *sumak kawsay* is not a new form of development, for the simple fact that this concept does not exist in indigenous culture as a condition for a desirable life, consequently, the concept of underdevelopment does not exist either (Huanacuni 2010). The *sumak kawsay* is a

paradigm that is no longer individualistic but communitarian, as the collective opposes individualism; where the harmony with life is opposed to the accumulation of goods and wealth; and where traditional knowledge exists before capitalist technological and scientific knowledge. In other words, a new diverse, relational and complementary worldview is opposed to the notion of being in a higher or lower level of living conditions from the Western view. In this sense, the indigenists oppose the unlimited accumulation of goods and wealth, since the enrichment of certain families generates social differences and breaks with the harmony of the community.

The socialist-statist trend also criticizes the productivist and consumerist values of the capitalist system as values of society, the market as the only form of social relations and the inequalities of the distribution of the benefits of nature and development. However, it promulgates an alternative development to capitalism and neoliberalism and not an alternative to development. Its position is that development must "revitalize the modern option of neo-Marxist development (21st century socialism, *sumak kawsay* socialism, community socialism...)" (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 31-32).

The former president of Ecuador, Rafael Correa explains the origin and guidelines of the Socialism of Well Living as follows:

The crisis was not only economic and democratic, it was also leaders and ideas after decades of domination, we managed to shake off the obsequious technocrats of the blind orthodoxy that took us to the bottom and now we dared to think again to generate our own academic agenda to have again our political economic thought, a Latin American political economic thought, this is what we have called the socialism of well living whose central axis is the social individual and solidarity. The socialism of well living is nourished by the reflexive combination of many socialisms including the classical or scientific but also the agrarian socialism of Emiliano Zapata, the Andean socialism of the Peruvian José Carlos Mariátegui, the social doctrine of the church, the theology of liberation and of the long history of emancipatory struggles of our peoples. Here we can already see the first role of the continental left (...) to present ideas, mobilizing illusions, free ourselves from intellectual colonialism. The socialism of good living is not based on models but on principles, this is a radical difference with traditional socialism, we reject recipes, dogmas (...) the fundamental problem is who commands in a society: elites or large majorities, capital or human beings, the market or society. The most serious damage that has been done to the economy (...) is to deprive that economy of its original nature of political economy (...) they have made us functional to the dominant powers (Correa, 2017) <sup>13</sup>.

For the indigenista-pachamamista, the alternative development takes into account "modernism as a cultural frame of reference, and development is an element of modernism" (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 31-32). For the post-development ecologist trend, "the concept of development implies the universalizing meta-narrative of the path they must follow and the destiny that all countries must achieve. They do not want another development, but multiple future strategies emanating from the vision of each people" (Hidalgo and Cubillo, 2014: 32).

#### 4. The application and scope of *sumak kawsay*

Regarding the development and application of the *sumak kawsay*, the socialist-statist current affirms that the application of the *sumak kawsay* must be done from the State through laws and public policies, however, the indigenista-pachamamista

have declared that the content of the *sumak kawsay* must be understood from the communities and applied in the indigenous communities.

On the other hand, the ecologist-post-development propose that the *sumak kawsay* must be a participatory, multicultural and local construction that includes indigenous knowledge and the different voices of emancipatory groups for its global application. Macas stated, “The indigenous communities have declared *sumak kawsay* as an option for the whole world, for humanity and for nature” (Macas, 2014: 186). Therefore, it is not a closed and exclusively circumscribed proposal by and for indigenous peoples and nationalities, but it rather has a pretension of universal application as long as it is understood as an alternative and critical paradigm of the postulates and principles of capitalism, of development and of its modern-rationalist sustenance.

## V. Conclusions

The three schools of thought coincide about the general conception of *sumak kawsay* as a way of life in harmony with oneself, with the community and with nature, supported by the principles of social equity and environmental sustainability. The differences are that the socialist-statist considers that the well living should satisfy material needs, enjoyment of relational goods and happiness, respect for diversity, ethics of coexistence, social equity, intergenerational justice, being and feeling; the ecologist and post-developmental highlights the biocentrism within the harmony with nature; the indigenist-pachamamista emphasizes the spiritual dimension.

Regarding the origin and application, the socialist-statist consider that the well living or *sumak kawsay* should be constructed mainly by the government and applied through laws and public policies at a national level in Ecuador and the rest of Latin America; the ecologists and post-developmental believe that the *sumak kawsay* or well living should be a proposal (re) constructed based on traditional Andean - Amazon philosophy and contributions of diverse sources of national and international knowledge, with a global application that considers each cultural and territorial context; the indigenist-pachamamistas refer only to *sumak kawsay* as a way of life that should be determined by indigenous people and applied only in their communities.

In reference with the scope, the three coincide that their proposals are a stand against the productivism and consumerism of the capitalist society and aim to build a more just and equal society. The socialist-statist align to the socialist and neo-Marxist conception of an alternative development and indicate that extractivism is a mean to change social and economic social structures; the ecologists and post-developmental and the indigenist-pachamamistas refer to their proposals as an alternative to development that is against extractivism in any form.

In conclusion, the ecologist and post-developmental school of thought seems to be a balance between the other two schools of thoughts, with an integral proposal that considers diverse emancipatory knowledge and practices, which allows to build a *sumak kawsay* in any context and society. They stand against the utopia of development and the ideology of progress from the capitalist system and advocate that the recognition of the *sumak kawsay* for a paradigmatic change requires questioning the individual rationality, eliminating coloniality and emancipating our minds. Their proposal appeals for a significant change in the organizational model of society, which is completely different from modern hegemony. This alternative to development is a life where the human being and the nature regain importance before the capital, and in which the possibilities and potentialities of people, families, communities and nature expand. In sum, a life in fullness, a life of *sumak kawsay*.

## Notes

- 1 Approved in a referendum on September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008. Effective from October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008.
- 2 Approved in a referendum on January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009. Effective from February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009.
- 3 See, Ramiro Ávila Santamaría, *Neoconstitucionalismo Andino* (2016); Ramiro Ávila Santamaría, *Neoconstitucionalismo transformador, el estado y el derecho en la constitución de 2008* (2011); Idón Moisés Chivi Vargas, coord., *Bolivia: Nueva Constitución Política del Estado, conceptos elementales para su desarrollo normativo* (2010).
- 4 Preamble to the Political Constitution of the Republic Ecuador of 2008.
- 5 Constitution of 2008, Preamble, Articles 10, 71, 72, 277.1, 389.
- 6 Constitution of 2008, Articles 66.12, 66.27, 275, 282.
- 7 Constitution of 2008, Articles 73, 83, 276.4, 290.2, 317, 319, 385, 387.3, 395.4, 399, 403.
- 8 Constitution of 2008, Article 317.
- 9 SENPLADES  
<http://www.planificacion.gob.ec/presidente-de-la-republica-destaca-que-ecuador-es-un-referente-regional-en-materia-de-planificacion/>
- 10 Contemporary mainstream discourses, as the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, have been criticized by the ecologist and post-developmental school of thought. They have claimed that "the development implicit in the SDGs is really a model of unsustainable maldevelopment, based on coloniality-patriarchy heteronormality of power-knowing-being, on capitalism and on anthropocentrism. And that has as consequences a global apartheid and an imperial way of life" (Hidalgo-Capitán, 2019). They propose the Good Living Goals as an alternative of the SDG's, which would reflect in 3 general goals and 21 specific goals: "All these goals would be aimed at achieving the three harmonies that should characterize global good living: biocentric sustainability, which would reflect harmony with all beings of nature; social equity, which would reflect harmony with all human beings; and personal satisfaction, which would reflect harmony with oneself" (Hidalgo-Capitán, 2019). Democracy, in this sense, would be reflected in the specifics goals that refer to harmony with all human beings, but it is proposed as participatory and peaceful, leaving out any possibility of being a speech driven by dictators or human rights offenders.
- 11 Sarayaku, recognized as "Kichwa Original Village of Sarayaku" is a native Kichwa Ecuadorian people, located in the Amazon Region, Province of Pastaza, located in the middle of the Bobonaza River.
- 12 Constitution of Bolivia, Article 8.
- 13 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E248NCoC0kk>, 2017 (Access on April 2018)

## Bibliography

- Acosta, Alberto y Martínez Esperanza (compiladores). *Derechos de la naturaleza. El futuro es ahora*, Quito: Abya Yala, 2009. [Nature rights. The future is now.]
- Acosta, Alberto. Solo imaginando otros mundos, se cambiará este. Reflexiones sobre el Buen Vivir en *Revista Sustentabilidad*, Bogotá: Universidad Nacional Abierta y a Distancia, 2010. [Only imagining other worlds, this world will change]
- Acosta, Alberto. "Prólogo. El fantasma del desarrollo", en Koldo Unceta. *Desarrollo, postrecimiento y Buen Vivir: debates e interrogantes*. Quito: Abya Yala, 2014. [Foreword. The ghost of development]
- Albo, Xavier. *Suma qamaña = el buen convivir*. Bolivia: CIPCA, 2009. [Sum qamaña = good living together.]
- Ávila, Ramiro. *El sumak kawsay: una crítica al modelo de desarrollo capitalista y una alternativa posible desde la literatura y las voces indígenas*. Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, 2015. [The sumak kawsay: a critique of the model of capitalist development and a



possible alternative from literature and indigenous voices.]

Bretón Victor / Cortez, David / Garcia, Fernando. En busca del sumak kawsay. Presentacion del Dossier. Iconos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales. Num. 48, Quito, enero 2014. [In search of Sumak Kawsay. Introduction to the Dossier]

Carpio, Jaime. Nuevos programas de desarrollo en America Latina, el sumak kawsay en Ecuador. (Ph.D. tesis Universidad de Alicante, 2015)[ New development programs in Latin America, the sumak kawsay in Ecuador.]

CEPAL 2016 <https://www.cepal.org/es/comunicados/la-pobreza-aumento-2016america-latina-alcanzo-al-307-su-poblacion-porcentaje-que-se>. Access on January 2018.

Chuji, Monica. “Modernidad, desarrollo, interculturalidad y Sumak Kawsay o Buen Vivir”, en Antonio Luis Hidalgo-Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy

Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva: CIM/FIUCUHU/Pydlos, 2014. [Modernity, development, interculturality and Sumak Kawsay or Good Living]

Chuji, Mónica. “Sumak Kawsay versus desarrollo”, en Antonio Luis Hidalgo-Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva: CIM/FIUCUHU/Pydlos, 2014b. [Sumak Kawsay versus development]

Cimadamore, Alberto D. *Pueblos indígenas y pobreza. Una introducción a los enfoques multidisciplinares*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales, 2006. [Indigenous peoples and poverty. An introduction to multidisciplinary approaches.]

Dávalos, Pablo. El Sumak Kawsay (“buen vivir”) y las censuras del desarrollo. Antonio Luis Hidalgo Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva, España: CIMFIUCUHUPydlos, 2014. [Sumak Kawsay ("well living") and development censorship.]

CODENPE. Sumak kawsay. *Buen vivir*. Serie Dialogos de Saberes, No. 4. Quito, 2001.

CONAIE. <https://conaie.org> (Access April 2018) [Sumak kawsay. Well living]

Correa, Rafael. El socialismo del buen vivir no se basa en modelos sino en principios. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E248NCoC0kk> (Access April, 2018) [The socialism of well living is not based on models but on principles.]

Cubillo-Guevara, Ana Patricia / Hidalgo-Capitan, Antonio Luis. El sumak kawsay genuino como fenómeno social amazónico ecuatoriano. España: OBETS N. 10 [Genuine sumak kawsay as an Ecuadorian Amazon social phenomenon.]

Dávalos, Pablo. *Movimientos indígenas en América Latina: el derecho a la palabra*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO), 2006. [Indigenous movements in Latin America: the right to speak.]

Escobar, Arturo, El postdesarrollo como concepto y practica social. En Daniel Moreno (coord.), *Politica economía, ambiente y sociedad en tiempos de globalización*. Venezuela: Universidad Central de Venezuela, 2005. [Post-development as a concept and social practice.]

Esterman, Josef. “Ecosofía andina. Un paradigma alternativo de convivencia cósmica y de vida plena”, en Atawallpa Oviedo. *Bifurcación del buen vivir y el sumak kawsay*. Quito: Ediciones SUMAK, 2014. [Andean ecosystem. An alternative paradigm of cosmic coexistence and fullness of life]

Estermann, Josef. *Filosofía andina, estudio intercultural de la sabiduría autóctona andina*, Quito, Ediciones Abya Yala, 1998. [Andean Philosophy, intercultural study of the indigenous Andean wisdom]

Gudynas, Eduardo. Tierra de sombras: Desafios de la sustentabilidad y del desarrollo territorial y local ante la globalización corporativa, *Separata Destakes del Foro Social Mundial 2011 en America Latina en Movimiento (ALAI)*, Quito, 2011. [Land of shadows: Challenges of sustainability and territorial and local development in the face of corporate globalization]

Hidalgo-Capitan, Antonio Luis / Cubillo-Guevara. *Seis debates abiertos sobre el sumak Kawsay* en ICONOS N. 48. Quito, 2014. [Six open debates on Sumak Kawsay]

Hidalgo-Capitán, Antonio Luis / Guillen, Alejandro/ Deleg, Nancy. “El indigenismo ecuatoriano y el Sumak Kawsay: entre el buen salvaje y la paja del paramo” Antonio Luis Hidalgo-Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva, 2014. [The Ecuadorian indigenism and the Sumak Kawsay:

between the good savage and the straw of the moor]

- Hidalgo-Capitán, A. L., García-Álvarez, S., Cubillo-Guevara, A. P., Medina-Carranco, N. (2019). Los Objetivos del Buen Vivir. Una propuesta alternativa a los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible. *Iberoamerican Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 8(1):6-57. DOI: 10.26754/ojs\_ried/ijds.354
- Houtart, Francois. “El concepto de Sumak Kausay (Buen vivir) y su correspondencia con el buen común de la humanidad”, en Centro Andino de Acción Popular. *Acerca del Buen Vivir*. Ecuador Debate N. 84. Quito: CAAP, 2011. [The concept of Sumak Kausay (Well Living) and its correspondence with the common good of humanity]
- Houtart, Francois. *El bien común de la humanidad*. Quito: IAEN, 2013. [The common good of humanity]
- Huanacuni, Fernando. *Buen Vivir / Vivir Bien. Filosofía, políticas, estrategias y experiencias regionales andinas*. Perú: Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas, 2010. [Well Living / Living Well. Philosophy, policies, strategies and regional Andean experiences.]
- Kowii, Ariruma. “El Sumak Kawsay”, en Antonio Luis Hidalgo-Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva: CIM/FIUCUHU/Pydlos, 2014. [The Sumak Kawsay]
- Lajo, Javier. *Recuperemos el sumak kawsay –el buen vivir- El waman, el puma y el amaru*. <https://www.alainet.org/es/active/25273>. 2008. [Let us recover the sumak kawsay - the good life - The waman, the puma and the amaru]
- Llasag, Raúl. “El sumak kawsay y sus restricciones constitucionales”, en Foro Revista de Derecho N.12. Quito: UASB-Ecuador, 2009. [The sumak kawsay and its constitutional restrictions]
- Leon, Mauricio. *Del discurso a la medición: Propuesta metodológica para medir el Buen Vivir en Ecuador*, Quito: INEC, 2015. [From discourse to measurement: Methodological proposal to measure the Well Living in Ecuador]
- Macas, Luis. “El Sumak Kawsay”, en Antonio Luis Hidalgo-Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva: CIM/FIUCUHU/Pydlos, 2014. [The Sumak Kawsay]
- Macas, Luis. “Sumak Kawsay. La vida en plenitud”, en Antonio Luis Hidalgo Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva: CIM/FIUCUHU/Pydlos, 2014b. [Sumak Kawsay. Fullness of Life]
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. “Sobre la colonialidad del ser: contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto.” En Santiago Castro-Gómez y Ramón Grosfoguel (editors). *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores, 2010. [On the coloniality of being: contributions to the development of a concept]
- Mignolo, Walter. “La colonialidad a lo largo y a lo ancho: el hemisferio occidental en el horizonte colonial de la modernidad.” En Lander, Edgardo. *Ciencias sociales: saberes coloniales y eurocéntricos*. En: Eduardo Lander (editor). *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*. Caracas: UNESCO-FACES, 2000. [Coloniality across: the western hemisphere in the colonial horizon of modernity]
- Mignolo, Walter. *La idea de América Latina. La herida colonial y la opción decolonial*. Barcelona: Gedisa, 2007. [The idea of Latin America. The colonial wound and de-colonial option]
- Muenala, Fabian. *Espiritualidad Indígena*. Kichwa Hatari, 2005. <https://kichwahatari.org/2015/04/24/espiritualidad-indigena/> (Access April 2018) [Indigenous Spirituality]
- Pacari, Nina. “Sumak Kawsay para que tengamos vida.” En Antonio Luis Hidalgo- Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva: CIM/FIUCUHU/Pydlos, 2014. [Sumak Kawsay so that we have life]
- Peregrina: <https://peregrinadanza.wordpress.com/2015/10/10/lascruces-cuadradas-chavin/>
- Quijano, Aníbal. “Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina.” En Lander, Edgardo. *Ciencias sociales: saberes coloniales y eurocéntricos*. En: Eduardo Lander (editor). *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*. Caracas: UNESCO-FACES, 2000. [Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism and Latin America]

- Quirola, Diana. "Sumak Kawsay. Hacia un nuevo pacto social en armonía con la naturaleza." En Alberto Acosta (Editor). *El Buen Vivir. Una via para el desarrollo*. Quito:Abya-Yala, 2009. [Sumak kawsay. Towards a new social pact in harmony with the nature]
- Ramirez, Rene. *Socialismo del Sumak Kawsay o bio-socialismo republicano*. Quito: SENPLADES, 2012. [Socialism of the Sumak Kawsay or republican bio-socialism]
- Rivas, Saul. *El lugar de la espiritualidad indígena en tiempos de globalización*. Venezuela: Aporrea, 2011. [The place of indigenous spirituality in times of globalization.]
- Sarayaku. "El libro de la vida de Sarayaku para defender nuestro futuro", en Antonio Luis Hidalgo Capitán, Alejandro Guillén García, Nancy Déleg Guazha (editores). *Antología del pensamiento indigenista ecuatoriano sobre Sumak Kawsay*. Huelva: CIM/FIUCUHU/Pydlos, 2014. [Sarayaku's book of life to defend our future]
- Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo (SENPLADES). *Buen vivir. Plan nacional 2013-2017. Todo el mundo mejor*. Quito: Senplades, 2013. [Well living. National Plan 2013-2017]
- Stefanoni, Pablo (2010b): "Indianismo y pachamamismo", *Rebelión*, Quito, 2010.
- Unceta, Koldo. *Desarrollo, postcrecimiento y Buen Vivir: debates e interrogantes*. Quito: Abya Yala, 2014. [Development, post-growth and Well Living: debates and questions]
- Viteri, Carlos: "Súmak Káusai. Una respuesta viable al desarrollo", Tesis de Licenciatura en Antropología Aplicada, Universidad Politécnica Salesiana del Ecuador, Quito, mimeo, 2003. [Súmak Káusai. A viable response to development]
- Viola, Andreu. *Antropología del desarrollo. Teorías y Estudios etnográficos en America Latina*. Barcelona:Paidós, 2000. [Anthropology of development. Theories and Ethnographic Studies in Latin America]
- Walsh, Catherine. *Interculturalidad, estado, sociedad. Luchas (de) coloniales de Nuestra época*. Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar y Abya Yala, 2009. [Interculturality, state, society. Struggles of (de) colonial of our time]